ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA712074 12/02/2015

Filing date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	92061516	
Party	Defendant WeDo, Inc.	
Correspondence Address	KATRINA G HULL MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP 100 EAST WISCONSIN SUITE 3300 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202 UNITED STATES	
Submission	Answer	
Filer's Name	Katrina G. Hull	
Filer's e-mail	kghull@michaelbest.com, mkeipdocket@michaelbest.com	
Signature	/katrinaghull/	
Date	12/02/2015	
Attachments	18221037_Answer_to_Petition_wExhibit_(12-2-15).PDF(85752 bytes)	

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

WeddingWire	e, Inc.	
S	,	Cancellation No. 92061516
	Deticiones	Mark: WEDO
v.	Petitioner,	Reg. No.: 4,338,563
WeDo, Inc.		
	Respondent.	

ANSWER & AFFIRMATIVE PLEADING

WeDo, Inc. ("WeDo" or "Respondent") answers WeddingWire, Inc.'s ("WeddingWire" or "Petitioner") Petition for Cancellation ("Petition") as follows:

- 1. Respondent lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 1 of the Petition and therefore denies the same.
- 2. Respondent lacks knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the allegations contained in paragraph 2 of the Petition and therefore denies the same.
 - 3. Admitted.
 - 4. Admitted.
 - 5. Denied.
- 6. Admitted that Respondent owns the webpage located at www.wedo.co. The remaining allegations in paragraph 6 of the Petition are denied.
 - 7. Denied.
 - 8. Denied.

- 9. Denied.
- 10. Denied.
- 11. Respondent incorporates by reference its admissions and denials to paragraphs 1 through 10 of the Petition.
 - 12. Denied.
- 13. Respondent incorporates by reference its admissions and denials to paragraphs 1 through 12 of the Petition.
 - 14. Denied.
- 15. Respondent incorporates by reference its admissions and denials to paragraphs 1 through 14 of the Petition.
 - 16. Denied.

Affirmative Pleading

Pursuant to TBMP 311.02(d), WeDo provides the following amplification of its denials to give WeddingWire further notice its defense:

- 1. U.S. consumers first used the WEDO® mobile application at a wedding in September 2012.
- 2. Before and after the September 2012 wedding, WeDo has been actively developing its mobile application and recruiting consumers to engage in testing its mobile application.
- 3. Within the last year, WeDo rolled out an updated version of the WEDO mobile application and the updated version continues to undergo consumer product testing.

- 4. WeDo alleged first use of its trademark in reliance on the advice of counsel and TMEP sections 904.03(i)(D) and 904.03(e), which explain that websites and software in a beta version provide appropriate specimens of use and support use of a trademark in U.S. commerce.
- 5. WeDo has never abandoned its use of the WEDO trademark as it continues to develop its product, advertise and promote its product and recruit consumers to test its product.
- 6. WeDo has not turned away any requests from customers that contact WeDo through its website and request to try the current version of its WEDO mobile application. Thus, the WEDO mobile application is available for public use, and is currently in use by consumers in three different states and one foreign country.
- 7. WeDo did not engage in fraud on the trademark office because consumers used the WEDO mobile application prior to the 2012 filing date of its U.S. trademark application. Moreover, WeDo relied on specific guidance in the TMEP that provides that software products in a beta testing phase can still be in use in U.S. commerce.
- 8. WeddingWire, which claims to be the nation's leading technology company serving the wedding industry, was well aware that WeDo was using its WEDO mark because Sonny Ganguly, WeddingWire's chief marketing officer, "favorited" a WeDo Twitter post, as shown in Exhibit A.
- 9. Mr. Ganguly also contacted WeDo in April 2015 to ask about purchasing the www.wedo.co domain name. WeDo responded to WeddingWire's inquiry with an offer to discuss its WEDO product with WeddingWire, but WeddingWire declined the invitation to learn about WeDo's product. Instead, WeddingWire hired attorneys to file this Petition in an attempt to bully WeDo, a start-up company with a limited legal budget, out of the market under the WEDO brand.

Respectfully submitted,

WeDo, Inc.

By its Attorneys,

Date: December 2, 2015 /katrinaghull/

Katrina G. Hull

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP

100 East Wisconsin, Suite 3300

Milwaukee, WI 53202 Phone: (414) 271-6560 Fax: (414) 277-0656

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND MAILING

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Answer is being served upon Petitioner's Attorney of Record by first-class mail, with a courtesy copy sent by e-mail:

> Jennifer Lee Taylor MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105 jtaylor@mofo.com

and that a copy of the same was filed electronically on the same date via ESTTA with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

Date: December 2, 2015 /katrinaghull/

Katrina G. Hull



Exhibit A



Sonny Ganguly (via Twitter) <notify@twitter.com> Unsubscribe

Apr 22



to WeDo 🕶

